



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/575,087

05/22/2006

James Fuller

092633-0107

8717

22428

7590

04/18/2011

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP

SUITE 500

3000 K STREET NW

WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

HORNING, MICHELLE S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1648

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/18/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/575,087

**Applicant(s)**

FULLER, JAMES

**Examiner**

MICHELLE S. HORNING

**Art Unit**

1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 85-130 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 94,95,104-108,114,115,117-123,129 and 130 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 85-93,96-103,109-113,116 and 124-128 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to communication filed 1/10/2011.

Claims 85-93, 96-103, 109-113, 116 and 124-128 are under current examination.

To allow entry of the rejections below, this action is made non-final; see 112, 2nd rejections below.

Any rejection(s) and/or objection(s) not reiterated herein have been withdrawn.

Given the rejections below, no additional species were searched.

#### ***Specification-Objection Maintained***

The use of the trademarks, including QUANTUM II, TWEEN, LIPOFECTION, etc. has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

As noted in the previous action, all trademarks in the instant specification must be properly addressed and the trademarks noted above are merely examples of improper use.

Given Applicant has failed to properly address all trademarks, this objection is maintained.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claims 85-93, 96-103, 109-113 and 116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.** As amended, the claims read upon: a nucleic acid construct comprising, in part, (c) a heterologous intron provided in place of the intron A region of the hCMV major immediate early gene, wherein the heterologous intron is not positioned between the exon 1 and the at least a part of exon 2 in (b); see claim 85 as a representative claim.

The prior art teaches that sequence of the 5' region of hCMV IE1 gene comprises exon 1 which is *followed by* intron A and then exon 2; see Chapman et al. (*Nucleic Acids Res.*, 1991, p. 3980-3981-cited). Also see para. [0153] of the instant specification. Thus, if a heterologous intron were to be provided *in place of* the intron A region as claimed, it would not be possible for the heterologous intron to be not positioned between exons 1 and 2. Note that here "in place of" is interpreted as the actual location wherein the heterologous intron is to be provided.

For reasons of search, the claims will be interpreted as the following: (c) a heterologous intron wherein the heterologous intron is not positioned between the exon 1 and the at least part of exon 2 in (b) and wherein the nucleic acid does not comprise the intron A region of the hCMV major intermediate gene.

Dependent claims fall herein.

**Claims 124-128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject**

**matter which applicant regards as the invention.** Independent claim 124 is directed to a nucleic acid construct comprising:

- (i). a promoter sequence;
- (ii). a coding sequence operably linked to the promoter sequence (i); and
- (iii). *an enhancer sequence 3' of* and operably linked to the coding sequence (ii);

wherein the enhancer sequence is derived from a 3'UTR of an HBsAg sequence and *the coding sequence (ii) is heterologous to the 3' enhancer sequence.*

See emphasis above in italics which read upon multiple interpretations.

Part (iii) of this claim reads upon an enhancer sequence 3' of –which may be interpreted as derived from- the coding sequence.

Alternatively, part (iii) of this claim may be reasonably interpreted as an enhancer sequence located within the construct at a position 3' relative to the coding sequence.

Also, it is not known from the claims if 3' of "an enhancer 3'" is describing a 3' region of the enhancer sequence or its location in the construct or a 3' region of a 3'UTR of an HBsAg sequence. Further clarification as to what 3' is referring is required.

For reasons of this action, this claim will be interpreted as a sequence located at a 3' position to the coding sequence.

Dependent claims fall herein.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 109-113 and 116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Catchpole (WO 02/36792-cited by IDS) and Nott et al. (RNA, 2003-see attached 892 form).**

The claims are drawn to (in part): a nucleic acid construct comprising a chimeric promoter sequence and a cloning site for insertion of a coding sequence in operable linkage with the chimeric promoter, wherein the chimeric promoter sequence comprises:

- (a) an hCMV immediate early promoter sequence;
- (b) exon 1 and at least a part of exon 2 of the hCMV major immediate sequence early gene; and,
- (c) a heterologous intron provided instead of the intron A region of the hCMV major immediate early gene, wherein the heterologous intron is not positioned between the exon 1 and the at least a part of exon 2 in (b).

Catchpole describes DNA vectors derived from hCMV immediate early gene which includes exon 1 and a heterologous intron that replaces the natural intron A of HCMV IE1 (see p. 2, lines 1-8). The author further describes including a part of HCMV IE1 exon 2 (p. 4, lines 3-10). Note that this meets "a chimeric promoter" as defined by parts (a)-(c) in claim 109. Catchpole describes including restriction sites in the vector for the insertion of a heterologous coding sequence and operably linking a sequence encoding a recombinant polypeptide to the promoter (see p. 4, lines 35+ to p. 6, lines 1-10); this meets the limitation of "cloning site" as required by claim 109. The author

provides coating the vector onto a gold bead (elected species H), delivering the vector via a gene gun, a syringe or a needle-free delivery approach and using a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier (see p. 16 and claim 11 of this reference and instant claims 110-113). It is noted here that the author provides the following recitation: "The vector may further include restriction sites to allow for insertion of a heterologous coding sequence. The restriction sites will preferably be positioned downstream of the HCMV IE1 5' untranslated fragment, including any heterologous intron which may be included in the vector"; see p. 4 (bottom) and p. 5 (top of the page).

Catchpole does not *explicitly* teach wherein the heterologous intron is not positioned between the exon 1 and the at least a part of exon 2 in (b); see part c of instant claim 109. Separately, Catchpole does not explicitly teach an isolated or purified DNA; see claim 116.

Nott et al. provides an analysis of intron effects on mammalian gene expression; see whole document. The authors teach that varying the position of a single intron leads to differential expression of a gene in a mammalian cell (p. 610, col. 2, Figure 2B and C and p. 613, col. 1).

Thudium discloses a method for isolating/purifying DNA constructs; p. 23, para. 3.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to vary the position of an intron in the method taught by Catchpole. One would have been motivated to do so for the advantage of modulating/optimizing gene expression as shown by Nott et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to purify the nucleic acid constructs taught by Catchpole. One would have been motivated to do so for the gain of optimizing results and minimizing contamination.

There would have been a reasonable expectation of success given the underlying materials and methods are widely known and commonly used as evidenced by the applied prior art (e.g. basic molecular biology techniques, construct preparation, etc.). The invention as a whole was clearly *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

**Claims 124-128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Bulla and Siddiqui (*J. Virol.*, 1988-see attached form 892), Protzer et al. (*PNAS*, 1999-see attached form 892) and Catchpole (WO 02/36792-cited by IDS).**

The claims are directed to (in part): a nucleic acid construct comprising:

- (i). a promoter sequence;
- (ii). a coding sequence operably linked to the promoter sequence (i); and
- (iii). an enhancer sequence 3' of and operably linked to the coding sequence (ii);

wherein the enhancer sequence is derived from a 3'UTR of an HBsAg sequence and the coding sequence (ii) is heterologous to the 3' enhancer sequence; see claim 124 as a representative claim.

Bulla and Siddiqui disclose a nucleic acid construct comprising a promoter sequence and an enhancer sequence derived from a 3'UTR of the HBsAg gene; see abstract and p. 1437, col. 2. The authors provide that this construct leads to the



successful, enhancer-dependent, expression of the HBsAg gene in mammalian cells, indicating that the HBsAg coding sequence is operably linked to the promoter and enhancer sequences; see Figure 2, p. 1438.

Bulla and Siddiqui do not teach a coding sequence that is heterologous to the 3'UTR enhancer (see claim 124); particles coated with the nucleic acid constructs (see claim 125); a dosage receptacle comprising such constructs (see claim 126), a particle delivery device loaded with coated particles (see claim 127), or a pharmaceutical preparation comprising a nucleic construct and a pharmaceutically acceptable excipient (see claim 128).

Protzer et al. disclose the gene transfer of interferon, a known therapeutic cytokine for the treatment of disease, including chronic hepatitis B; see whole document including abstract and introduction.

Catchpole provides coating a nucleic acid vector onto a gold bead (elected species H; see instant claim 125), delivering the vector via a gene gun, a syringe or a needle-free delivery approach (see claims 126 and 127) and using a pharmaceutically acceptable excipient (see instant claim 128); see p. 16 and claim 11 of this reference disclosing the claim limitations of claims 125-128.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate known heterologous coding sequences, such as interferon, as a substitute to the coding sequence in the construct taught by Bulla and Siddiqui. One would have been motivated to do so because Bulla and Siddiqui teach that this construct leads to the successful expression of a gene in mammalian cells.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate coated particles, a dosage receptable, delivery device or a pharmaceutical composition comprising a nucleic acid construct or coated particle in the method taught by Bulla and Siddiqui. One would have been motivated to do so because the underlying materials and methods are commonly used as methods of nucleic acid delivery.

There would have been a reasonable expectation of success given the underlying techniques are widely known and commonly used as evidenced by the prior art (e.g. construction of nucleic acid vectors, etc.). The invention as a whole was clearly *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

**Claims 85-93 and 96-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of WO 02/36792 (hereinafter as “Catchpole”, published 5/10/2002-cited by IDS), Nott et al. (*RNA*, 2003-see attached 892 form), WO 02/031137 (hereinafter as “Thudium”-cited by IDS), Li et al. (Gene Therapy, 2001-previously cited), US Patent 6165477 (hereinafter as “Ivy”), and Palmiter et al. (*PNAS*, 1991-previously cited) as further evidenced by GenBank Accession AF143308 (1999-see attached 892), PGPUB 20030124523 (hereinafter as “Asselbergs”-previously cited) and PGPUB 20030175711 (hereinafter as “Renner”-previously cited).**

Claim 85 and its dependent claims are drawn to (in part): A nucleic acid construct comprising:

- (i) a chimeric promoter sequence which comprises:
  - (a) an hCMV immediate early promoter sequence;

- (b) exon 1 and at least a part of exon 2 of the hCMV major immediate early gene; and
  - (c) a heterologous intron provided in place of the intron A region of the hCMV major immediate early gene, wherein the heterologous intron is not positioned between the exon 1 and the atleast a part of exon 2 in (b);
  - (ii) a coding sequence in operable linkage with the chimeric promoter;
  - (iii) a non-translated leader sequence which is selected from the HBVpreS2 antigen sequence, HBV e-antigen sequence and HSV type 2gD antigen sequence and which is in operable linkage with the chimeric promoter; and
  - (iv) an enhancer sequence which is derived from a 3' untranslated region (UTR) of a HBsAg sequence or of a simian CMV immediate early gene sequence, which is in operable linkage with the chimeric promoter and which is downstream of the coding sequence.
- Catchpole describes DNA vectors derived from hCMV immediate early gene which includes exon 1 and a heterologous intron that replaces the natural intron A of HCMV IE1 (see p. 2, lines 1-8). The author further describes including a part of HCMV IE1 exon 2 (p. 4, lines 3-10). Note that this meets "a chimeric promoter" as defined by at least parts (a)-(c) in claim 85 and the sequence comprising structural limitations of claim 116. Catchpole describes including restriction sites into the vector for the insertion of a heterologous coding sequence and operably linking a sequence encoding a recombinant polypeptide to the promoter (see p. 4, lines 35+ to p. 6, lines 1-10 and part (ii) of claims 85 and claim 90). The author provides coating the vector onto a gold bead

(elected species H), delivering the vector via a gene gun, a syringe or a needle-free delivery approach and using a pharmaceutically acceptable excipient (see p. 16 and claim 11 of this reference and instant claims 96-102).

Catchpole does not describe using a heterologous intron that is not positioned between the exon 1 and the at least a part of exon 2 (see claim 85, part (i)(c)), a non-translated leader sequence which is HBVpreS2 antigen sequence (see claim 85, part (iii)), an enhancer sequence derived from 3'UTR HBsAg sequence (see claim 85, part (iv)), a rabbit beta-globin gene (claim 87, part (ii)), an HBVsAg antigen (elected species G), the enhancer sequence which is the sequence set forth by SEQ ID NO: 8 (HBV enhancer; elected species B and claim 86, part (iv)), a heterologous intron comprising the rat insulin intron A (elected species C) or a human tissue plasminogen activator secretion signal peptide (elected species F).

Nott et al. provides an analysis of intron effects on mammalian gene expression; see whole document. The authors teach that varying the position of a single intron leads to differential expression of a gene in a mammalian cell (p. 610, col. 2, Figure 2B and C and p. 613, col. 1).

Thudium discloses the use of a construct for the expression of a heterologous coding sequence in the pCMVkm-Luciferase in which the rabbit beta-globin gene was incorporated (see Example 2, p. 35); this meets the limitation of further incorporating one or more sequences which is a rabbit beta-globin gene (claim 87, part (ii)). The authors disclose that when the optimized rabbit beta-globin gene was used, this construct showed 4 times higher in the expression of p55 gag as compared to the

parent vector; given the successful expression of p55 gag, this gene must be in operable linkage with the chimeric promoter. Note that p55 gag meets the limitation of a viral antigen (see claims 90-92) and a construct. The author also provides that the polypeptide sequences encoding proteins may include HBV antigens including the sAg/preS2 combination (see p. 21, para. 1; instant claims 85 (iii) and (iv) and 91-93; and elected species G). The author further describes techniques for isolating DNA (p. 23, para. 3 as required by claim 116). Asselbergs is cited for teaching the sequence set forth by SEQ ID NO: 10 which inherently encodes the rabbit beta-globin gene (see SEQ ID NO: 1 of this application; elected species E). Renner is cited for teaching the sequence set forth by SEQ ID NO: 5 which inherently encodes HBVpreS2 (see SEQ ID NO: 133 of this application; elected species A).

Li et al. describe a nucleic acid construct comprising a promoter sequence, a coding sequence and a simian virus 40 (SV40) enhancer wherein the coding sequence is heterologous to the SV40; see abstract and Figures 2 and 3, p. 496. It is further noted that the authors describe administering such construct to a subject; see p. 495, col. 1, para. 3. The authors disclose that incorporation of this enhancer enhances gene expression (see title). GenBank Accession No. AF143308 (1999) is cited for providing this enhancer and its known sequence set forth by SEQ ID NO: 8, elected species B.

Ivy teaches using the human tissue plasminogen activator secretion signal sequence for secretion of protein products from Drosophila cells so that the secreted products can be easily purified and prepared as a vaccine (col. 6, lines 40+).

Palmiter et al. teaches that heterologous introns can enhance expression of transgenes in mice (see title). The authors provide that insertion of heterologous intron A of the rat insulin II gene increased expression by 75-fold (p. 480, col. 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to vary the position of an intron in the method taught by Catchpole. One would have been motivated to do so for the advantage of modulating/optimizing gene expression as shown by Nott et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further incorporate various elements in the construct taught by Catchpole, including an SV40 enhancer sequence, intron A of the rat insulin gene and a rabbit beta-globin gene. One would have been motivated to do so because the prior art teaches that such incorporation leads to successful or enhanced expression of polypeptides. There would have been a reasonable expectation of success, given the prior art demonstrates such success and the underlying techniques are widely known and commonly used as shown by the prior art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further incorporate various elements in the construct taught by Catchpole, including the known sAg/preS2 combination taught by Thudium. One would have been motivated to do so in order to express this known combination as a substitute antigen. There would have been a reasonable expectation of success, given the underlying techniques are widely known and commonly used as shown by the prior art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a sequence encoding the human tissue plasminogen activator secretion signal sequence in the construct taught by Catchpole. One would have been motivated to do so for the advantage of purifying and preparing the expressed protein as a vaccine in *Drosophila*. There would have been a reasonable expectation of success because this signal peptide is well known and commonly used as demonstrated by the prior art.

The invention as a whole was clearly *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

**Claim 103 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of WO 02/36792 (hereinafter as “Catchpole”, published 5/10/2002-cited by IDS), Nott et al. (*RNA*, 2003-see attached 892 form), WO 02/031137 (hereinafter as “Thudium”-cited by IDS), Li et al. (*Gene Therapy*, 2001-previously cited), US Patent 6165477 (hereinafter as “Ivy”), and Palmiter et al. (*PNAS*, 1991-previously cited) as further evidenced by GenBank Accession AF143308 (1999-see attached 892), PGPUB 20030124523 (hereinafter as “Asselbergs” -previously cited) and PGPUB 20030175711 (hereinafter as “Renner” -previously cited) as applied to claims 85-93 and 96-102 above, and further in view of Scharton-Kersten et al. (*Infection and Immunity*, 2000-previously cited).**

The claim is further drawn to a composition of claim 102 which further comprises an additional construct comprising a coding sequence which encodes a polypeptide which an ADP ribosylating bacterial subunit A and B (elected species I).

The combination of Catchpole, Nott, Thudium, Li et al., Ivy and Palmitter et al. (as further evidenced by GenBank Ac. No. AF143308, Asselbergs and Renner) teach (in part): a nucleic acid construct comprising:

- (i) a chimeric promoter sequence which comprises:
  - (a) an hCMV immediate early promoter sequence;
  - (b) exon 1 and at least a part of exon 2 of the hCMV major immediate early gene; and
  - (c) a heterologous intron provided in place of the intron A region of the hCMV major immediate early gene;
- (ii) a coding sequence in operable linkage with the chimeric promoter;
- (iii) a non-translated leader sequence which is selected from the HBVpreS2 antigen sequence, HBV e-antigen sequence and HSV type 2gD antigen sequence and which is in operable linkage with the chimeric promoter; and
- (iv) an enhancer sequence which is derived from a 3' untranslated region (UTR) of a HBsAg sequence or of a simian CMV immediate early gene sequence, which is in operable linkage with the chimeric promoter and which is downstream of the coding sequence.

The combination of Catchpole, Nott, Thudium, Li et al., Ivy and Palmitter (as further evidenced by Moriarty et al., Dean et al., Asselbergs and Renner) does not teach the composition of claim 102 which further comprises an additional construct comprising a coding sequence which encodes a polypeptide which an ADP ribosylating bacterial subunits A and B (elected species I).



Scharton-Kersten et al. disclose that a bacterial LT composed of A and B subunits and the ADP-ribosylation activity have known adjuvant function (p. 5308, col. 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate other constructs comprising sequences encoding polypeptides known to have adjuvant activity, such as ADP ribosylating bacterial subunits A and B, in the composition disclosed by Catchpole, Nott, Thudium, Li et al., Ivy and Palmiter (as further evidenced by GenBank Ac. No. AF143308, Asselbergs and Renner). One would have been motivated to do for the gain of optimizing results (i.e. increase an immune response). There would have been a reasonable expectation of success given the underlying techniques are widely known and commonly used as shown by the prior art references applied. The invention as a whole was clearly *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 85-93, 96-103, 109-113, 116 and 124-128 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims

are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

**Claims 85-93, 96-103, 109-113, 116, 124-128 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 115-123, 126, 132-133 and 137-156 of copending Application No. 11/815, 278.** Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are directed to nucleic acid constructs that comprise similar elements including a chimeric promoter,

encoded viral antigens, HBVpreS2 sequence, a 3' UTR sequence from a simian CMV immediate early gene sequence, ADP ribosylating bacterial toxin subunits, rat insulin gene intron A sequence, carrier particles which are gold particles and uses thereof.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 1/10/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant requests that this rejection is held in abeyance. Until all of the rejections and objections have been properly addressed, this rejection is maintained for reasons of record.

### ***Conclusion***

No claim is allowed at this time.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHELLE S. HORNING whose telephone number is (571)272-9036. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ZACHARIAH LUCAS can be reached on 571-272-0905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. S. H./  
Examiner, Art Unit 1648

/Zachariah Lucas/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1648